DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 449 SP 026 505

AUTHOR Meade, Edward J., Jr.
TITLE Teachers and Teaching: A Look Back and a View Ahead. The 1985 Martin Buskin Memorial Lecture.
PUB DATE 23 Mar 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Education Writers Association (Boston, MA, March 23, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Pluralism; Economic Factors; *Educational History; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; *Futures (of Society); School Demography; School Desegregation; *Social Influences; Teacher Distribution; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A retrospect of teachers and teaching in American schools from the 1950s to the 1980s is presented. In this overview of American education, the impact of the following events and social changes is measured: (1) the "baby boom" of the 1950s; (2) the focus upon suburban living; (3) the effect of the "baby boom" on the demand for teachers; (4) the effect of television in schools and the home; (5) the concentration upon science and mathematics as a reaction to Sputnik; (6) desegregation, the erosion of the cities, and focus on disadvantaged children; (7) the increased social agenda of the schools; (8) the Vietnam war; (9) increased career options for women; (10) declining enrollment; (11) the diversifying of the needs of students and the rise of multiculturalism; (12) the advent of computers; and (13) the increase in demands for accountability. An analysis of these societal factors and their impact upon schooling includes a discussion on the changing role of teachers and the challenges to schools of education to produce effective teachers in the future. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272449

TEACHERS AND TEACHING: A Look Back and a View Ahead

The 1985 Martin Buskin Memorial Lecture

Education Writers Association

Annual Meeting, Boston, March 23, 1985

Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Chief Program Officer
The Ford Foundation

What follows is a retrospect of teachers and teaching in American schools from about 30 years ago, and a prospect of teachers and teaching over the next decade or so. To be more graphic, I will deliberately overstate and be fairly selective in the information I use to make my case.

Two basic assumptions undergird my remarks. The first one is very simple: Teachers have been and will continue to be central to education in schools. Recent reports about schools -- however many you wish to count, and regardless of their specific recommendations -- acknowledge the centrality of the teacher as the key to improving schools. The second is related, namely that changes in curriculum, more knowledge about learning, and the increased use of technology for teaching and learning also will underscore again the importance of the teacher. As I see them, these changes will require more of teachers and make more demands on them, particularly on their intellectual and academic capacities and their skills of pedagogy as they help others to learn.

My point of departure in history is about the mid-Fifties, the point at which we had earlier national attention to excellence in education. Remember the mid-Fifties and suburban sprawl? Remember the American dream at that time? -- to have a family and house in the suburbs, room to grow -- and the suburbs grew. We saw the beginnings of the baby boom in the schools.

SP 026 505

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. J. Meade, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

As a result, schools needed three "Fs": funds, facilities, and faculties. That was the agenda: get money, get buildings, hire teachers and deal with the growing number of students. Then, too, there were reports about education and, later, some federal legislation. Remember Why Johnny Can't Read by Rudolph Flesch? About the most significant report of that time was the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report in 1958, The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America. That report urged excellent schools and excellent education. Later, James Conant told us what a good high school should look like in his book, The American High School, published in 1959.

During this time of attention on the academic quality of schooling, a significant piece of federal legislation was enacted: the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) -- the first elementary-secondary school legislation in the nation's history that focused on improving the quality of schools. Put too simply, this legislation was intended to intellectually arm our young so they could compete with the Russians who had recently launched Sputnik. The NDEA focused on science, math, and foreign languages. Not uncommon even today. By and large, all of these reports and legislation were aimed at the academic mission of the school viewed in traditional ways. Schools were considered academic places. The aim was to enrich them academically. As a result, more students in schools and colleges would be more able and, consequently, our society more able to compete with the Russians and their technology.

Some look back on the NDEA and say that it "creamed the cream" -- that is, it skimmed the top of the cream from the rest of the cream and never dealt with the milk, so to speak. There wasn't much ferment in the country about the milk -- or about educational opportunity. Rather, there was sort of a common agreement that we should give more help to the more able. If some

students were meritorious, we should make them more meritorious. Witness the birth of the National Merit Scholarships. Still, the rest of the students were there, and lurking around in the shadows at that point was school desegregation. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 was viewed largely as a regional issue; segregation was a problem in the South, but probably not so much elsewhere. Early attempts to deal with desegregation then were not attempts to change education much. They were simply to get "those kids" in other schools. Nobody said we should change programs. Rather, the objective was to simply mix the kids with other kids in the schools. And, as you will recall, there was little compliance with the court's decision to act with "all deliberate speed"; we went slowly, slowly, slowly.

That was the picture in the 1950s, the time of earlier attention to excellence in American education. What were teachers like back then? By and large, they were like most of the students, or so we wanted to think. It's been said that if one visited the schools in the Fifties you saw schools with school boards, teachers, principals, students and parents all looking alike. Why? Because the focus was on the suburban schools and those in small towns. As far as innovation in teacher training, about the only one at that point was a program called the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.). This program, too, reflected the times. We wanted a higher quality of academic teachers in the schools, so there was an effort, largely supported by the Ford Foundation at a cost of some $30 million, to create M.A.T. programs for men and women out of liberal arts colleges, who, in the space of a year or so, would be lightly exposed to some professional education and an extended, often paid, internship in schools, and then thrust into regular teaching. In short, this program intended to leaven the academic quality of the teaching that already was in schools.

Shortly, as we were approaching the Sixties, the baby boom was having a substantial effect on schools. Let me just use one anecdote to illustrate its effect on the demand for teachers. About that time, I was at a meeting of a national association and encountered a county superintendent of schools from the East talking to the dean of education from a Midwest university. The superintendent asked the Dean how many graduates he was expecting that year. The dean responded, "About 390," and the superintendent said, "You know, I have to hire 433 teachers over the next year or so; I could take every one of your graduates." There was such a need for teachers that if you were a warm body and somebody said you were a teacher, there was a job for you. Teacher education programs in schools of education at colleges and universities expanded, primarily at the undergraduate level. After all, it was cheaper to produce teachers in four years than five years, and for the elementary teacher in particular the state-of-the-art of many of those training programs was that it was better to know "how" than to know "what." A number of new and not so rigorous programs were then developed to produce more and more teachers to fill up the schools and deal with the children -- the children of some of us, but not those of all of us.

There also was some experimentation with technology. At the Ford Foundation, we supported several experiments to extend teachers through television, that is, put the "best" teachers on television so they could help more students. Putting it too boldly, some of this was an attempt to shove television into the mainstream of America's classrooms. The results were hardly noticeable after a few years, and probably for good reason. In any event, and while instructional television could be and is useful, it surely was not the panacea some thought it could be back then.

Let me refer now to the turn of the Sixties. What was the hangover from the 1950s' focus on excellence? First, there was activity to accelerate the able with such programs as Early Admission to College and Advanced Placement Examinations; the thesis: if they have the wherewithal to advance, they should be allowed to do so. Early admissions, while assessed as a success, soon abated as high schools fought losing their academic "cream" and colleges seemed not to care. I wonder how colleges would react to it today. But, Advanced Placement grew and grew and now is as common on the education scene as is, for an example at the other end of the education spectrum, Sesame Street. Second, there was what I would call the "New Deal" in curricular reform. Remember PSSC, BSCS, Chem Bond, SMSG and the so-called teacher-proof curriculum, largely put together by very able academicians in the disciplines. It has been said that those curricula were very good because they had integrity with respect to chemistry, mathematics, science, or whatever the subject was, but they didn't have much to say to children. Clearly, no one ever sat down and said we have to make a teacher-proof curriculum, but that was the outcome, at least in part, and as a result, these curricula did not take as fully as expected. To put it in the words of -- I think it was Charlie Brown -- "You can't teach new math with an old math mind."

So that was the hangover of the earlier excellence movement: changing the academic quality of the schools through curriculum. Meanwhile, enrollments were still climbing, and funds and facilities and faculty were still priorities. Teaching jobs were abundant; it was a seller's market. But lurking around were such things as the civil rights movement, beginnings of the women's movement, and a modest war in Southeast Asia. No one yet knew what effect they would have on the schools. But we knew there was going to be more of a federal presence in the field of education. I remember spending

weekends in Washington in the early 1960's discussing what eventually became the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. And, in the teacher ranks, there was a flexing of muscles by the teacher organizations. They were stumping hard in the seller's market to get better salaries and improved conditions for teachers.

But at the same time, again at the turn of the Sixties, we were also beginning to become aware of something that had been going on for some time, namely the erosion of our cities. Everybody was in or trying to get to the suburbs -- at least those who could get there -- and the cities were eroding. Also, but slowly at first, there emerged some early initiatives about a formerly invisible group, the population we came to call the "disadvantaged." No, these students weren't new; they'd always been there, but they were acknowledged nationally only about the turn of the 1960s.

As a result, there were projects related to the schools in the great cities. For example, I remember an experiment with preschools in Baltimore about 1959 or 1960. Could Headstart be far behind? Suddenly, too, we heard about remedial education as a formal part of schools. In my school days, when you didn't do well in class, you were kept after school. Teachers didn't say you were doing remedial work; they said you didn't do what you were supposed to do so come back and try it again. We didn't have remedial education in my day, but we did. Even in the early days of remedial education, the regular academic programs were hardly changed. By and large, if you look at remedial education in the early 1960s, it seemed to reinforce the idea that what we were doing in the mainstream was pretty good; it was just that some of these kids didn't fit so we were giving them this "extra" on the side so they could fit into the mainstream. That "extra," it turned out, was not as simple as many thought it would be. Suffice it to say, that this effort -- later called

"compensatory education" -- was as challenging as any instructional mission schools had ever faced. Clearly, that mission was, and continues to be, a demanding test of the pedagogical power of schools.

Something else was happening to teaching. Teaching was not simply passing on the knowledge and the like. Now in the 1960s, there was an implicit undertone that if you wanted to teach, it was some kind of a social calling and not only an educational or intellectual calling. Teachers should like "those kids," understand "those kids," and help them to be somebody. An increasing number of new and diverse programs and projects were developed to deal with self-image, cultural understanding, and so on. Teaching took on a kind of Peace Corps approach: Get in there and help those less fortunate. That mood prevailed for the early years of the 1960s, and on into the mid-Sixties.

I'm now going to try in one fell swoop to cover from about the mid-Sixties to the mid-Seventies. Enrollments were growing, but very slowly. The baby boom -- sort of like the pig in the python -- was passing through the schools from the elementary to the middle schools and on up to the high schools. We still needed more teachers, not so much because there were more students, but because there were more programs. We had more things we had to do: new and expanded programs, ESEA and its various titles, Headstart, bilingual education, later on the Education Professional Development Act, the Teacher Corps and the Emergency School Assistance Act. Through the Johnson-Nixon timeline, more programs meant more and more staff. Some added teachers, but many also added teacher aides, counselors, and certainly more administrators. Talk about bulges - look at the ranks of middle management of education.

Also, not-so-subtle changes in teacher supply were taking place.

Remember how schools used to rely on women teachers? We didn't have to recruit women for schools; they came a-running because there weren't a lot of other places for them to work. But, as the Sixties unfolded, women were no longer captives of the teacher labor market. Other options were opening up. The same holds for minorities. More opportunities in all schools, not just in segregated schools, and also new opportunities outside of schools opened up for minority graduates from the colleges.

Still, there was an increased demand, particularly from the federal sector, to make sure the staffs of schools and school systems were more diverse to better serve an increasing diversity of students. This, too, added to change in the education labor market. The social agenda of the schools became more dominant. Schools needed to deal more directly with matters such as social harmony and needed to provide services that were not -- in the cold light -- strictly academic services, intellectual services, or educational services. We had to feed more kids, get others clothes, transport many more to school, deal with their social problems, etc. Schools had an expanding social service agenda. Education for the handicapped became a matter for more and more schools. About the same time -- mid-Sixties to early Seventies -- we had a lot of "relevant" curriculum. We shouldn't teach this or that because it wasn't relevant. We had to find something that was relevant. I'm not trying to make any value judgment about all of this. Instead, I'm trying to give you notches through time.

The drive to desegregate and integrate schools continued with more force and more vigor both in the South and then the North. Dealing with desegregation may well have been a higher order purpose and need for the society, namely to have the schools integrated even if we weren't prepared to do it in our neighborhoods. Maybe, too, it was a higher priority than

teaching students to read, write, spell, or learn new math. Not, of course, that we shouldn't or that we need not do both.

There were other changes as well. No longer could you look at a school system and say that, if you know the teacher, the principal, the school board and the superintendent, you understood the school system. There now was community participation and organized teacher labor. New York went through school decentralization. At the national level in the mid-Sixties President Johnson was defining the Great Society and declaring war on poverty. And far, far away there was a war in Vietnam, which among other things later created distrust on the part of a lot of young people in anything that was an established institution, including schools and colleges.

Clearly, there was a changing political climate, and the schools had a larger social agenda. Academic priorities were around, but other matters were sometimes, if not often, more important. The academic agenda was there, but somewhat diminished or, perhaps, at a steady state. As I said earlier, there was an increased focus on remedial help, special services, and work on attendance and discipline; schools had more counselors, social workers, health workers, bilingual staff, and so on. One could argue that, as a result, there was a decline in the dominance of the teacher's intellectual role. It wasn't any longer of the greatest importance. Put another way, other roles of the teacher were of equal importance, and, in some places at some times, overshadowed the academic role.

Who were teaching during the mid-Sixties to the mid-Seventies? Those who were there during the Forties and early Fifties were gone or going. Those old line teachers, most of whom came out of normal schools or state teachers colleges, had retired or were about to. Where were the N.A.T.s, the hundreds or few thousands of them? Many of those had moved on as well. Some were

dissatisfied with the job and left; others left for new opportunities in other professions; and some bubbled up into leadership positions in education. There were more men teachers in the elementary schools, thanks in large part to the Vietnam war. Teaching was drawing fewer academically talented persons, including many women and minorities for whom the women's and civil rights movements had helped achieve access into other, formerly closed, positions. At the same time, teachers were highly organized and collective bargaining was a full fact in many communities. They, and other groups such as Title I advisory committees, had more voice in the governance of education, particularly from the mid-Seventies through the beginning of the 1980s.

Enrollments in schools were declining. The babies were gone; they were in college, at least those who could get there. But, while enrollments went down, enrollments of poor and otherwise disadvantaged students were higher and represented higher percentages in many communities. We had schools with fewer students, but with more of them who had more diverse needs that had to be met. Many schools were closing. The teacher force was being reduced by retirement incentives or reductions in force by and large governed by the collective bargaining agreements of "last in-first out," regardless of one's degree of performance. What kinds of issues were we paying attention to in the mid-Seventies? Hardly only to academic issues. Instead, there were such matters as school finance reform, school desegregation, law and order in the schools, drug abuse, and safety. Certainly they were important -- and still are. Certainly, and also during this time, all of them were as dominant or more so in the realms of policy-making than were issues about instruction and teaching.

Technology came back again. It wasn't television this time; it was something called programmed instruction. Remember programmed instruction --

Skinner's pigeons? Now we have the computer. Time and experience will tell us about its contribution.

The word "accountability" became very important. States were setting up well-intentioned programs to improve fundamental learning or basic skills, with added funds and of course with tests to measure the outcome of the uses of those funds. This understandable zeal of legislatures and school boards and the public at large was intended to assure that we got solid learning in basic areas and to hold those who received this help accountable by the standardized test. Not quite, if you will, teacher-proof curriculum, but close. Some might argue that we are seeing more of that now in the 1980s.

What else are we trying in more recent years and even now? We're trying partnerships between schools and businesses as a road to school improvement. Some are promising and others are not. At the very least, however, people outside schools are understanding schools better, particularly people who have some voice and power that can make a difference for schools in their communities. I'm pleased that these outside partners are collaborating, for they're being reminded how important schools are to the health and well-being of their communities. To me, that's the objective, not simply to have a loaned executive working with students in the tutorial program. Useful as that kind of help is, schools need to be better understood and more broadly supported by the larger community.

We now have other partnerships: schools and colleges joining together. To me, it's deja vu. I cut my teeth in the early Sixties on a number of Ford-supported efforts to bring schools and universities together. Then universities did it because it was a nice thing to do. Now they do it because they need students, and improved high schools might produce more of them.

In the schools, themselves, one can find magnets and options -- diversity. More choices now exist in the public system. Most of them seem to be useful for those they serve. At the same time again -- the end of the Seventies to the early Eighties -- we now have accumulated a significant body of knowledge about learning, about children, about effective schools and about teaching. For example, research on effective schools reminds us that if you want to improve a school, you improve a school. After all, where does teaching and learning take place? They take place in schools, and we're learning more and more about how important it is to bring responsibility, resources and authority down to that level. We now know better than we did how important it is that the people who have responsibility at the school level -- principals, teachers, staff and community -- have some reasonable consensus about what the school should do and is doing. It is important, therefore, that people in schools have the capacity to decide and to deploy resources available to them. But, first, they have to have resources; they need to have authority with their responsibility, and they have to work together collectively. We know that, but do we do that?

Where are we today. In many parts of this country today, there are schools in which there is a larger number of less academically able and prepared teachers who must teach a larger number of more diverse and less advantaged students. To overstate it, there are situations across the country where the most educationally needy are being taught by the less intellectually able. Have we, in a sense, deintellectualized teaching? Have we deintellectualized the schools? In my judgment, to some degree we have, and for understandable and good reasons. As I went through my retrospect of the last twenty years, there were (and still are) other problems, other non-academic, non-instruction issues that schools had to deal with. As a

result, one of the consequences has been to diminish the academic, intellectual role of the school.

I have read the recent reports about schools -- some 25 or 30 of them, depending on what you include. Many of them argue, to use my term, that we have deintellectualized the schools. The reports recommend that students should not only acquire knowledge, but also, and more importantly, that students learn how to think critically, to be analytical, to solve problems, to be adaptable. That's not simply knowing the state capital of Missouri. Maybe it's better to ask why the state capital of Missouri is where it is: an outcome of history, economics, politics, geography or a combination of them all. To understand - not simply to know. These reports seek students whose heads are not just full of knowledge but who are able to use knowledge. Put another way, the reports remind us that schools need to deal with a kind of agenda that we haven't dealt with very well in the recent past (and, I remind you, for good reasons in some cases). Maybe, it is one that was never dealt with well enough for most students at any time. And, while some reports recommend more homework, longer school days or years, fewer courses, and curbing the cafeteria approach to curriculum, nevertheless, the major thrust is for - and using my term - a stronger intellectual agenda for the schools. Not only do the reports speak about this agenda, some also speak to a set of values or an ethos that schools should have that is intellectual in nature. Further, many of the reports also underscore the need to have youngsters understand that they should actively participate in the democratic society and understand the interdependence of our nation with others, and the interdependence of their community with their state and the like.

It seems to me, therefore, that if that agenda is to be served, then teachers need to be more knowledgeable, more analytical, more intellectually

and pedagogically nimble, if you will, than we've been accustomed to in recent years. In addition, they have to be individuals of worth, persons in and of themselves who have value, and who represent the values of learned persons. They should be individuals of merit and persons to whom others can look for integrity and quality. And, certainly, many of the reports want teachers to be much more professional and to be treated as such -- professionals free to teach with more intellectual autonomy than they now have.

Take that view: We need teachers who are more professional and have more autonomy so as to make wise and sound decisions about the materials they select and use and the ways in which they teach children. Put it to one side, and then on the other side note what a lot of states and communities are doing with well-intended initiatives . They call for stronger standards, more uniform instructional approaches, and more common curriculum materials. These are not coming from ill-meaning persons. They want what we all want -- to make sure everyone can read, write, compute, think, and so on. But many of these initiatives are fairly utilitarian. Is that what education is about? So, a paradox: the move for more intellectualism, if you will, and another approach that is aimed more at functional literacy and employment skills. Of course, that's important -- getting those skills and getting that job. In many schools, these goals are being driven by a test, a prescribed curriculum, and too often by a prescribed way to teach it. The difference in these two views is not necessarily a matter of right or wrong. But it is a matter that perplexes those who are caught in that dilemma. Who is caught in that dilemma? The teachers and principals in our schools are caught between, on the one hand, being accepted as professionals and intellectuals, and working accordingly, or, on the other hand, being viewed as technicians in a "utilitarian" system resembling some kind of instructional assembly line. As

I travel about, this is an issue that is increasingly apparent in our nation's schools.

So much for the past to the present. What do all of my meanderings mean for the future. Taking into account my look this past year at teachers and teaching, and my involvement in school reform over the past 25 years, I strongly believe it is time to work more directly on issues of teachers and teaching. That's where the action has to be. I recently started my own examination of these matters, first by attempting to gather some data about teachers and teaching. Guess what, data about these matters are hardly there. I tried to get data about teachers and the conditions under which they work, and found that much of what could be illuminating and useful is not available.

You'd be surprised at the lack of common definitions of terms. What's a full-time teacher? One data system calls it this, and another calls it that. How about the student-teacher ratio? Well, in one place it is defined this way, and in another it is defined that way. We can't accurately tell what the math and science teacher shortage looks like. There is a shortage, but we can't tell if it's truly national or spotty -- or even what constitutes a math or science teacher. The data about teachers are partial; they're often too general; and they lack a distinction between the levels of the subject field in which the teachers teach and the administrative units in which they serve. Moreover, many data sets are not compatible; they're built on different time frames, collected from different sampling bases and differently worded questions, and can't be pooled and brought together with firmness.

A second issue about teachers and teaching has to do with the professional working conditions of teachers in schools -- not conditions for

their social welfare or their personal well-being, although such conditions and those for students in some schools I have visited leave much to be desired. It has to be disheartening to teachers in schools to have to serve as professionals under conditions that are not conducive to teaching -- conditions that do not allow them to be effective and to grow intellectually, academically and pedagogically. I'm always puzzled by why an instructor at East Overshoe State College has a telephone, an office and a desk, and hours set aside for advising, whereas a teacher in a high school has access to none of it. That may be a small matter, but it's symbolic of the larger problem.

More to the point, we need to restore professionalism and, I'll use my word again, the intellectual quality in the teachers who are out there. Schools and teachers have been deintellectualized for a variety of reasons, some of which are understandable as we have had to deal with other, perhaps more important, issues in schools. Still, we now must find ways to allow teachers to rejuvenate themselves. Certainly, summer institutes are good, as are weekend workshops, and evening courses and seminars. But, why can't we create environments in schools as we have environments in other professional places -- executive offices, hospitals, colleges, universities -- that give teachers the opportunities to reintellectualize on a continuous, systematic basis. To overstate somewhat, if schools are learning places for teachers, they will be learning places for children. We need to build that kind of capacity in the schools. It is going to take a lot of time and probably a lot of money. Nonetheless, it's possible, and there are some beginnings around.

There is a good example in Pittsburgh where the school system has created the Schenley High School Teacher Center to which, periodically, fifty teachers from all of the other Pittsburgh high schools come for eight weeks to engage directly in the further development of their teaching skills. In

addition to honing their teaching skills with help from other teachers, they also get help from people who are knowledgeable in the academic disciplines -- math, science and so on -- so as to update their knowledge in their subject matter. In these eight weeks they get a chance to do something few teachers ever do all their professional lives -- examine and systematically improve their craft.

Other schools have rearranged their schedules to put in a full week's time in four days instead of five. Moreover, they are accomplishing more and spending more "time on task" in four days than they did in five days. It's the same amount of instructional time, but now in fewer days and with fewer interruptions during their class time with students. The fifth day is for teacher development. Also, dentists learned a long time ago that they don't need to use all their high level skills to clean your teeth. Instead, they assign that important task to somebody else. The dentist still makes the decision to have your teeth cleaned but someone else does it. We don't do that with teachers. If you've ever visited an elementary school, you know what I mean. Teachers do everything. They put on the overshoes, monitor halls, duplicate materials, lunch with children -- not unimportant to do -- but why a teacher? Why can't we find ways to use others to do these and other necessary tasks that do not require the high levels of academic, intellectual and pedagogical skills we expect of the teacher?

There are a lot of ways to develop a capacity in schools for teachers to help other teachers. Unfortunately, we haven't found many ways and means to do it other than by promoting some of them to the central office, thus cutting them off from their colleagues in schools -- or we put them in colleges, and then they come back to the school to teach the weekend seminar for teachers. Research tells us that professionals get most of their help and accept and use it when it comes from their peers. What have we done with

teachers. More often than not, we take those teachers who help other teachers and put them elsewhere. We do not arrange schools in ways to allow the teachers in them to help one another to be more pedagogically effective.

Finally, as you know, there is a growing shortage of teachers. Why? -- the baby boomlet, a lot of teacher retirements coming up, more financially rewarding opportunites in other career fields and the production of new teachers going down. Now is the time to examine how we should recruit, prepare, and induct new teachers. I was recently asked by the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education to examine many of the reports about schools and see what they say about teacher education. There was very little in them about teacher education in any direct sense. So, I examined what they said about teachers, what they assumed teachers to be like, to learn whether in some collective sense I could relate that information to teacher education. Here's what I found.

First, I found that most of these reports assumed that teachers are well-educated -- surprise! -- not, well-educated to be a teacher, but well-educated generally. I don't know if that means a liberal education and a bachelor's degree, but it does mean <u>well-educated</u>. Second, the reports assume that teachers are intellectually curious. Recall how the reports were concerned about the dullness of instruction. These reports seek improvement in the curiosity of students. Therefore, it seems to me, that if the teachers are curious, then maybe the kids will be so encouraged. And, of course, the reports labored heavily that a teacher better know what it is that he or she teaches. Surely, teachers better have knowledge of their subject field or fields at some level of mastery.

There also were some other assumptions about teachers, a little more subtle or implicit, but nonetheless there. For example, teachers better know

more about American society, if not other societies as well. The reports believe that it is important for schools (and, therefore, teachers) to transmit values, history and traditions -- to perpetuate the culture so to speak -- and to help others to adapt it to meet the future. So, it seems to me, that teachers ought to know about history and the political, social and economic systems within which our society functions. Also, teachers certainly ought to know children: how they learn and how they develop and the contexts in which they live. The reports said in effect that you can't teach them it you don't know them. Sensible, it seems to me. Then, of course there is the role of teaching itself. Using the words of Ted Sizer and Mortimer Adler, "teachers should coach." Put another way, teachers should be the pedagogical decision-makers and managers. Either way, that means the teacher is neither the player nor the worker. Rather, the teacher is the coach or manager, and the student is the player or the worker. In short, the teacher needs to make executive decisions -- about content, method -- about pedagogy. That's a very interesting way to view teachers.

Further, the reports assumed teachers are continuous learners, engaged in learning while teaching and also active in the intellectual life of the community. Sounds like the old days, doesn't it -- the old headmaster or the one-room school teacher who were a part of the academic life of the community. Finally, these reports assumed a career in teaching -- not in education, but in teaching -- a career in teaching. Much has been said about merit pay, career ladders, master teachers, and the like. But, a question: How do you build a hierarchical arrangement in schoolhouses when more and more we know that collaboration and cooperation among teachers are keys to an improved and effective school? Maybe there is a fit between these schemes and these findings. At any rate, teachers should be able to have a rewarding career without having to leave teaching.

In summary, my analysis of the reports revealed eight factors related to teachers: (1) a teacher is, first, a well-educated person; (2) he or she ought to be an intellectually curious person; (3) he or she should have mastered the knowledge about the subject or subjects he or she is expected to teach; (4) a teacher ought to be knowledgeable about the American society: its history, its political, economic and social systems, and about the place and role of education in it; (5) a teacher should know about children -- how they develop, how they learn, and the contexts in which they live; (6) a teacher should "coach" or "manage" learning and be a decision-maker in the pedagogical sense; (7) a teacher should be a continuous learner; and, finally, (8) a teacher should be able to have a career in teaching -- one that is varied and rewarding.

Currently, there is much ferment about the preparation of new teachers for the schools. There now are schemes to admit persons into teaching who have not been formally prepared to be teachers. You've heard of them -- a college graduate in history, math, or whatever wanting to teach is first asked to demonstrate he or she is proficient in the subject, and is then sent into a school to work with a teacher to learn how to teach -- somewhat of an apprentice approach. At the other extreme, so to speak, are a number of teacher preparation programs that are "standing pat" -- changing little or nothing, but expecting that with the teacher shortage they will simply be needed without having to change their programs at all. I have to believe that somewhere between these two positions are the real and useful answers to the kind of teacher preparation we will need if we are to have teachers with the kinds of characteristics I outlined earlier. Clearly, we will need teachers who know what is needed to be known and learned, who will know students and how to help them learn, and, therefore, who will be able to teach more effectively.

At the very least, the colleges and universities that prepare teachers need to view the preparation of teachers as a priority and use all their best intellectual and professional resources to do so, and not rely only on those in their education departments. Also, schools and school systems will need to be more actively engaged with higher education in the clinical preparation of new teachers. No longer can schools treat this responsibility casually. If clinical training is essential to preparing teachers, as I believe it is, then the schools need to be more formally arranged and prepared to be a partner (perhaps the dominant partner) in this aspect of teacher preparation. We will need arrangements in the schools that foster clinical training, and we will need teachers in the schools who have the capacity and the time, and the support, to work with those being trained to teach.

Further, once a person is inducted into teaching -- on the job as a beginning teacher -- the responsibility of college or university is not finished as is currently the case in most instances. Higher education, as much as the schools, has a responsibility to nurture those beginners so that they will continue to grow academically and intellectually as well as pedagogically. After all, school teachers and college professors are largely engaged in the same enterprise. They are peers, and the collaboration of both -- during teacher preparation and after it -- ought to strengthen both schools and colleges.

Where does this all lead to for teacher preparation. Does it lead again to the M.A.T.? Perhaps. Does it lead to teacher preparation taking longer? I think so. I don't see how we can meet the demands for academic, intellectual and professional competency along with those for solid clinical training in just four years. After all, we now assume that four years of education in the liberal arts is the minimum for someone to be "well-educated." Teachers for America's future need to be that and more,

much more. They need to be the best we can find -- as well-educated as any first-rate college graduate who has a sensible "mix" of knowledge of content -- the real and fundamental stuff of the fields in which they will teach -- along with that knowledge which undergirds a teacher's craft, and with clinical training on a par with the best now offered by other human-serving professions.

Still, all of this kind of preparation will be of little consequence unless the schools in which teachers teach are, themselves, places that are stimulating and arranged for learning -- not only for students, but also for teachers. Clearly, one aspect of that is more intellectual or academic autonomy for teachers. The fact that many teachers are not allowed to participate in the selection of instructional materials for the students they are expected to teach is wrong, plain wrong. The fact that many teachers are restrained in how they teach by having to conform to prescribed -- no, mandated -- styles of teaching wrought by excessively rigid curricula is wrong, just wrong. The fact that accountability by teachers has become more important than trust in teachers is wrong, just wrong. We need teachers, not technicians. We need individuals as teachers, not semi-robots on some kind of increasingly utilitarian instructional assembly line. We need teachers in schools where there are opportunities to grow, to have a career, and to be rewarded accordingly as teachers who continue to teach, rather than having them seek growth and reward by leaving teaching.

For this society to find such talent for teaching, to educate and train it for teaching, and to allow it to properly serve the children and adolescents in our schools is no small task. It will require a new vision, a new understanding, and a new commitment by all of us.

But we can start. How? First, our society must come to truly value our children; our society must understand that children are our future. That in itself would be a giant step, for, unfortunately, our rhetoric about the value of children and about them as being our future are hardly matched by the realities in which we deal with and educate children. If we can so value children, and understand that, indeed, they are our future, then we must also understand that the development of their academic and intellectual knowledge and skills is essential to their future. It is, if you will, their "currency" for the future. And, that being so, then it is teachers who are a key to helping them to acquire that "currency" and, in turn, to that future for them and for us as well.

0154X/3769X